



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/557,282	11/17/2005	Naoyuki Harada	64467(70551)	9028
21874 7590 09/01/2009 EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP P.O. BOX 55874 BOSTON, MA 02205				
EXAMINER				
HONG, JOHN C				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3726				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/01/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/557,282

Applicant(s)

HARADA ET AL.

Examiner

JOHN C. HONG

Art Unit

3726

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23-25, 28 and 30-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23-25, 28 and 30-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/31/06, 11/17/05
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 31,32,36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by AAPA(Applicant's Admitted Prior Art).

3. AAPA as disclosed in the specification [0002]-[0003] , teaches a recycled resin recovered using the disassembling apparatus for the washing machine and a resin product formed of the recycled resin.

“[E]ven though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.” In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). MPEP 2113.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-5, 9 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP1121471.

'471 teaches Regarding Claim(s) 1-5, a disassembling method for disassembling a washing machine, the washing machine including: a vessel formed of resin and including a water tub; a driven unit including a dehydration tub and making a rotational movement in the vessel; and a drive unit including at least one of a motor and a reduction-gear unit, the drive unit being connected through a coupling rod to the driven unit and disposed on the outside of the vessel, and the method comprising a release step of releasing the connection between the drive unit and the driven unit, wherein the release step is carried out in a state where the coupling rod and the driven unit are secured (ABSTRACT; Figs 9-11).

'471 fails to teach the step of applying force, along the axial direction of the coupling rod, in the direction of separating the drive unit and the driven unit from each other.

But the step of applying force to along the axial direction of the coupling rod, in the direction of separating the drive unit and the driven unit from each other, is well known method in the art, and It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to employ this known step on '471 so as to break the connection effectively.

Regarding Claim(s) 9 and 33, '471 teach the limitation except the apparatus comprising separating means for applying force, along the axial direction of the coupling rod, in the direction of separating the drive unit and the driven unit from each other, and the separating means including means for stopping one of the vessel or the driven unit and the drive unit and for separating the other from the one.

But separating means for applying force, along the axial direction of the coupling rod, in the direction of separating the drive unit and the driven unit from each other, and the separating means including means for stopping one of the vessel or the driven unit and the drive unit and for separating the other from the one, is well known in the art and It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to utilize this well known means on the apparatus of '471 so as to break the connection effectively.

6. Claims 10,12,14,16,19,21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP11212471 as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of JP11255467.

'471 teach the limitation except the separating means includes: drive-unit holding means for holding the drive unit; driven-unit holding means for holding the driven unit; and first moving means for moving, along the axial direction, at least one of the drive-unit holding means and the driven-unit holding means; the separating means includes: drive-unit holding means for holding the drive unit; driven-unit holding means for holding the driven unit; and first moving means for moving, along the axial direction, at least one of the drive-unit holding means and the driven-unit holding means; and the separating means includes: drive-unit holding means for holding the drive unit; driven-unit holding means for holding the driven unit; and the drive-unit grasping means includes an open/close hook formed to freely open and close, and the open/close hook has a leading end for catching the drive unit.

'467 teaches the limitations (Abstract; Figs1 and 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to utilize the apparatus as taught by '467 on the apparatus of '471 so as to break the connection effectively.

7. Claims 28, 30 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP11212471 as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of JP11255467.

Regarding Claim(s) 28 and 30, '471 teach the limitation except the apparatus comprising a table for disposing an object to be disassembled, wherein said table is formed to have a movable mount surface; and a shatterproof plate formed to surround said separating means.

It is well known in the art to utilize apparatus comprising a table for disposing an object to be disassembled, wherein said table is formed to have a movable mount surface; and a shatterproof plate formed to surround said separating means, and It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to utilize this known apparatus on '471.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOHN C. HONG whose telephone number is 571-272-4529. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-17:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, DAVID BRYANT can be reached on 571-272-4526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JOHN C HONG/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3726

Jh
8/28/09